



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,157	01/19/2006	Wittich Kaule	2732-173	7236
6449	7590	08/07/2008	EXAMINER	
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.			CALLAWAY, JADE R	
1425 K STREET, N.W.				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2872	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/07/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTO-PAT-Email@rfem.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/565,157	KAULE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	JADE CALLAWAY	2872	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2008, 19 January 2006.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-76 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 6-8,13-38,40-47,49-58,60,61 and 64-75 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,9-12,39,48,59,62,63 and 76 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 January 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/19/06</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group 1(a) in the reply filed on 7/10/08 is acknowledged.
2. Claims 6-8, 13-38, 40-47, 49-58, 60-61, 64-75 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected Groups 1(b-o), there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 7/10/08.

### ***Priority***

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Drawings***

4. The drawings were received on 1/19/06. These drawings are acceptable.

### ***Specification***

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

6. Abstract, line 1, delete "The invention relates to"

### ***Claim Objections***

7. Claim 63 is objected to because of the following informalities: it appears that "or" is misspelled as "of" in line 2. For examining purposes "of" in line 2 of claim 63 will be interpreted as "or." Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Double Patenting***

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-3, 9 and 76 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,876,472. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other.

Consider claims 1 and 76, the Menz et al. patent ('472) teaches a security element, which has at least one area with a diffraction structure, which under specific

viewing conditions reconstructs a diffractive image, wherein the area has subareas, which do not take part in the reconstruction of the diffractive image, and which represent a recognizable information, characterized in that the information represented by the subareas is recognizable substantially only under the specific viewing conditions of the diffractive image [claim 1].

Consider claim 2, the Menz et al. patent ('472) teaches a security element characterized in that the area has a first reflection layer, which supports the reconstruction of the diffractive image [claim 13].

Consider claim 3, the Menz et al. patent ('472) teaches a security element characterized in that the subareas have no diffraction structure, and that the first reflection layer is disposed in both the area of the diffraction structure and the area of the subareas [claims 1 and 13].

Consider claim 9, the Menz et al. patent ('472) teaches a security element, which has at least one area with a diffraction structure, which under specific viewing conditions reconstructs a diffractive image, wherein the area has subareas, which do not take part in the reconstruction of the diffractive image, and which represent a recognizable information, characterized in that the information represented by the subareas is recognizable under specific viewing conditions differing from the specific viewing conditions of the diffractive image [claim 1].

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claims 1-3, 9, 39, 48 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Menz et al. (2002/0044313).

Consider claims 1, 9 and 76, Menz et al. teach (e.g. figures 1-3) a security element, which has at least one area (1, hologram recording material) with a diffraction structure (region 21), which under specific viewing conditions reconstructs a diffractive image, wherein the area has subareas (region 22), which do not take part in the reconstruction of the diffractive image, and which represent a recognizable information, characterized in that the information represented by the subareas is recognizable substantially only under viewing conditions differing from the specific viewing conditions of the diffractive image [0010-0011, 0015, 0075-0077].

Consider claim 2, Menz et al. teach (e.g. figures 1-3) a security element characterized in that the area (1, hologram recording material) has a first reflection layer (metallized coating), which supports the reconstruction of the diffractive image [0091].

Consider claim 3, Menz et al. teach (e.g. figures 1-3) a security element characterized in that the subareas have no diffractive structure, and that the first reflection layer is disposed in both the area of the diffraction structure and the area of the subareas [0010-0011, 0015, 0075-0077, 0091].

Consider claim 39, Menz et al. teach (e.g. figures 1-3) a method for producing a security element with the following procedure steps: a) producing at least one area with a diffractive structure (region 21), which under specific viewing conditions reconstructs a diffractive image, b) producing sub areas (regions 22) which do not take part in the

reconstruction of the diffractive image, and which represent a recognizable information, wherein the subareas are integrated in the area with the diffraction structure such that the information represented by the subareas is recognizable mainly only under the specific viewing conditions of the diffractive image [0010-0011, 0015, 0070-0077].

Consider claim 48, Menz et al. teach (e.g. figures 1-3) a method for producing a security element, with the following procedure steps: a) producing at least one area with a diffraction structure (region 21), which under specific viewing conditions reconstructs a diffractive image, b) producing subareas, which do not take part in the reconstruction of the diffractive image, and which represent a recognizable information, wherein the subareas are integrated in the area with the diffraction structure such that the information represented by the subareas is recognizable under viewing conditions differing from the specific viewing conditions of the diffractive image [0010-0011, 0015, 0070-0077].

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 4-5, 10-12, 59, 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menz et al. (2002/0044313) in view of Ishimoto et al. (2002/0191234).

Consider claim 4 and 10, Menz et al. disclose a security element wherein the subareas are formed by gaps in the first reflection layer (the hologram structure with subareas 21 and 22 can be a reflection type hologram) [0023]. However, Menz et al. do not disclose a security element characterized in that the area has a transparent plastic layer, in which the diffraction structure is present in the form of a relief structure, that the first reflection layer is disposed on the surface of the plastic layer which is provided with the diffraction structure, and that the opposite surface of the plastic layer has a second reflection layer. Menz et al. and Ishimoto et al. are related as security element devices. Ishimoto et al. teaches (e.g. figure 2b) a security element characterized in that the area has a transparent plastic layer (17, pressure sensitive adhesive layer), in which the diffraction structure is present in the form of a relief structure (12, relief layer), that the first reflection layer (materials of layer 11) is disposed on the surface of the plastic layer which is provided with the diffraction structure (11, volume hologram), and that the opposite surface of the plastic layer has a second reflection layer (metal films of 12) [0022-0024, 0029, 0038, 0042]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Menz et al., as taught by Ishimoto et al., in order to protect the holograms to increase durability.

Consider claim 5, the modified Menz et al. reference discloses (e.g. figures 1-3 of Menz et al.) a security element characterized in that the first and second reflection layers are made of materials having substantially the same reflecting properties (Note: Ag can be used for both hologram layers, 11 and 12 of Menz et al.; as such they would have substantially the same reflecting properties) [0029, 0038 of Menz et al.].

Consider claims 11 and 62, the modified Menz et al. reference discloses a security element characterized in that the opposite surface of the plastic layer has a second reflection layer (metal films of 12), wherein the first and second reflection layers are made of differently-colored materials (Note: the holograms can be colored) [0024-0025 of Menz et al., and 0022-0024 of Ishimoto et al.].

Consider claim 12, the modified Menz et al. reference discloses (e.g. figure 2b of Ishimoto et al.) a security element characterized in that the area is disposed on a transparent carrier (18, protective layer), so that the information represented by the subareas is recognizable in transmitted light [0022-0024 of Ishimoto et al.].

Consider claim 59 and 63, the modified Menz et al. reference discloses a security element wherein the materials are substantially the same material (both have a composition of Ag) [0029, 0038 of Ishimoto et al.]. However, the modified Menz et al. reference does not disclose that the material is the same and is made of one of aluminum, copper or gold. Note that the Court has held that the selection of a known material based on its suitability for its intended use supports a *prima facie* obviousness determination; see **Sinclair & Carroll Co. v. Interchemical Corp.**, 325 U.S. 327, 65 USPQ 297 (1945). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of the modified Menz et al. reference in order to create the same viewing characteristics from each hologram so that they have the same brightness such that one hologram is not more noticeable than the other depending on viewing angle.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JADE CALLAWAY whose telephone number is (571)272-8199. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:00 am - 4:30 pm est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephone B. Allen can be reached on 571-272-2434. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JRC  
/Jade R. Callaway/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2872

/Arnel C. Lavarias/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2872